

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Office of
Governmental
and Public Affairs

Major News Releases and Speeches

June 10 - June 17, 1983

IN THIS ISSUE:

Testimony—

Testimony by Under Secretary of Agriculture Daniel G. Amstutz before the Joint Economic Committee and the Agriculture Subcommittee, June 14.

Testimony by Douglas W. MacCleery, deputy assistant secretary, natural resources and environment, USDA, before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States House of Representatives, Concerning H.R. 2027, H.R. 2211 and H.R. 2982, June 14.

News Releases—

Block Names Esparza as Director of Minority Affairs

USDA Proposes Minor Changes to Grain Exporting Registration Rules

USDA Proposes Rule to Amend Duties and Conduct Regulations

Two Scientists Share Animal Research Honor, \$10,000 Prize

USDA Accepting Applications From Noncertified Egg Producers

USDA Withdraws Proposal to Test Export Swine

Director Named for USDA's National Agricultural Library

Cryogenics: Scientists Bring Frozen Insect Cells Back to Life

Instructions for Canning Fruits and Vegetables Revised for Greater Safety

USDA Seeks Comments on Texas Quarantine Issue

Cranberry Growers Vote to Continue Marketing Order

Foreign Agriculture Ministers to Visit Block Farm

Bush, Shultz to Address July 12-13 Ag Summit

IN THIS ISSUE:—Continued on next page

IN THIS ISSUE: —Continued

Backgrounder—
Cannabis Eradication

Testimony

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

Testimony by Under Secretary of Agriculture Daniel G. Amstutz before the Joint Economic Committee and the Agriculture Subcommittee, June 14.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss policies affecting agricultural trade with you.

The close relationship between domestic farm policy, foreign policy and U.S. agricultural trade has become increasingly apparent and of growing importance in recent years.

The sharp drop in U.S. agricultural exports since 1981 has made this eminently clear. It also has pointed up sharply how heavily U.S. agriculture has come to depend on exports as a source of income and growth. In the boom years of the 1970s and into the eighties, U.S. agricultural exports nearly tripled in volume and went up six times in value. U.S. farmers put 55 million more cropland acres into production in response to what seemed to be an endless increase in world demand.

Exports, once representing about one-tenth of U.S. farmers' marketing returns, now account for fully one-fourth, and farmers depend on foreign markets as an outlet for one-third of their harvested cropland.

Our agricultural system is geared to export, and exports are down sharply after 10 years of dramatic growth that reached a record \$43.8 billion in fiscal 1981. They dropped to \$39.1 billion last year, and if our current forecast holds, they will slip by 9 percent to about \$35.5 billion in the current year.

Secretary Block discussed the impact of the recent past on the farm economy with the committee last month—farm prices low, farm income down, and government costs for farm support programs tripled in two years.

Clearly, for U.S. agriculture to prosper, it must export. This administration intends for agriculture to prosper, so we intend for agriculture to export.

The primary causes of the decline in farm exports are well known—large world supplies, a strong dollar, global recession, lagging demand,

competitor trade practices and the monetary and debt problems that have ensued, which are particularly painful for developing countries.

These conditions affect other industries as well as agriculture, but there are additional factors that bear on agriculture and that relate to the subject of this hearing today. They are the lack of workable rules in international agricultural trade and the impact of U.S. domestic farm programs on the U.S. position in a highly competitive market.

These and the other factors I have cited must be addressed if U.S. agriculture is to regain the export momentum of the past—global economics, trading rules and the structure of U.S. farm programs.

The global economy will eventually turn around. International cooperation to promote a sound and sustained recovery was pledged by the participants at the Williamsburg Summit.

However, it will take more than renewed buying power in foreign markets for U.S. agriculture to realize its full potential.

Weak demand and record or near-record world crop production over the past two years triggered intense competition in the world market. This has resulted in widespread and growing use of export subsidies in world markets and rising protectionist sentiment in domestic markets, our own included.

These conditions not only contributed to the drop in U.S. agricultural exports, but they have reduced the U.S. presence in foreign markets.

A prime example is the Middle East, where subsidized exports of chickens from the European Community and Brazil virtually have driven U.S. poultry from that market. Grain subsidies have hurt us in traditional markets around the world.

The European Community is subsidizing the export of all its major agricultural commodities—grains, sugar, beef, poultry and dairy, and of processed products as well.

This has encouraged competing countries to do the same. Besides Brazil, Canada and Argentina are using extra measures to put their products into the world market. These include export subsidies, grain board prices set below market levels, export credits and subsidized interest rates on credit.

The United States has acted to meet this competition in a manner consistent with its policy of liberal trade. We have more than doubled

the funds available for commercial export credit guarantees, we have implemented a program of blended export credit, and we have sharpened and boosted funding for our market development activities.

We are making maximum use of Public Law 480, the long-standing Food for Peace Program. P.L. 480 funding this year totals \$1.5 billion, \$100 million more than for shipments last year, and we made an aggressive and successful effort to speed up the signing of agreements with importing countries. More agreements were signed in the first quarter of the fiscal year than any first quarter in the last decade.

Blended credit has been an outstanding success. It combines direct credit, offered interest free by the Commodity Credit Corporation, with CCC commercial credit guarantees to produce a lower interest rate for farm product exports.

Since the program was announced last October, blended credit has been approved to finance the sale of more than 7 million tons of U.S. wheat, corn, rice, soybeans, cotton and other products.

Credit and stepped up market development work helped to stem U.S. losses in a slack and predatory export market, but when demand returns, genuine, sustainable export growth will require a trading system in which market forces, not government actions, are the primary influence on the movement of commodities.

The temptation in agriculture is great, and understandable, to fight subsidy with subsidy, to meet foreign distortions of trade with distortions of our own.

But U.S. agriculture, with its tremendous productive capacity and a comparative advantage in the production of most commodities, would be the long-term loser in such a confrontation.

The 1970s, in which the market largely took over from governments in allotting trade, showed the potential for U.S. agriculture in a relatively open trading climate. World trade in grains during that period rose by almost 100 million tons and U.S. farmers supplied three-fourths of the increase.

To reach its export potential, U.S. agriculture needs a trading system in which comparative advantage is allowed to work.

For us to try to enhance farm income with marketing boards, or to share markets within a cartel, or to join the subsidy game in the long

term would be to deny our producers the opportunity for full export growth as recovery comes followed by rising demand.

Our Number One priority in trade policy must be to continue to adhere to the principles of free trade and to work until those principles are embodied in the rules for international agricultural trade.

And within that priority, the most immediate task is to bring under control the use of export subsidies. This can't wait for the time-consuming processes of the multilateral trade rounds of the past.

USDA analysts estimate that subsidies of the European Community alone have cost the United States \$5 billion to \$6 billion a year in exports since 1980. If conditions don't change, the loss could be up to \$8 billion by 1987.

We will meet with the Community here next week to continue discussions begun last year to address the trade issues that divide us. The concerns of both sides on several issues have been spelled out and discussed, and I am sure that it is clear to them that export subsidies remain our top priority.

Elsewhere in trade policy, we are pressing Japan for improved market access on a number of agricultural products, particularly beef and citrus. Japan has taken steps to liberalize access for some products in which we are interested, but they are far short of what we believe to be necessary. Talks on these issues are continuing.

Next to achieving liberalized trade, the most important export challenge is to get the most from the two markets with the greatest potential for import growth—China and the Soviet Union.

The embargo on export sales to the Soviet Union, which was imposed in 1980 for foreign policy reasons, was drastic and is proving to be a long-term setback for U.S. farm exports.

The year before the embargo, the United States supplied 70 percent of Soviet grain import requirements. That has dropped to an estimated 20 percent this year—and this is a market that almost doubled to more than 40 million tons last year and has a potential of up to 65 million tons a year.

Beyond the loss in the Soviet market, the embargo seriously eroded confidence in the reliability of the U.S. as a supplier, not only in the Soviet Union but among other importers as well. This was a confidence that agriculture had been working to restore since it was first shaken by

the soybean embargo of 1973 and again by government interruptions of grain exports later in the decade.

President Reagan took the major step to open the Soviet market fully to U.S. producers when he lifted the embargo in April 1981. To restore confidence in the U.S. as a supplier, he issued a statement on farm export policy on March 22, 1982. In it, he pledged that:

- No restrictions will be imposed on the export of farm products because of rising domestic prices;

- Farm exports will not be used as an instrument of foreign policy except in extreme situations and then only as part of a broader embargo;

- And the United States will continue to pursue the objective of a world agricultural market freed of trade barriers and unfair trade practices.

Early this year, he signed the contract sanctity legislation passed by the Congress as further assurance of reliable supplies.

In April, he authorized the negotiation of a new long-term grain agreement, and these negotiations are under way.

The road back in that market will be difficult, but with a new agreement, the way will be open.

China, with its billion consumers, has been growing as a market for us since government and trade contacts were started more than a decade ago. The resumption of full diplomatic relations in 1979 led to stepped up market development activities by the U.S. government and the trade.

Market development work in China has been spearheaded by the U.S. Feed Grains Council, the American Soybean Association and U.S. Wheat Associates. They are non-profit U.S. commodity organizations that work with the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service to develop foreign markets for their own commodities.

There are more than 50 of these market development cooperators, representing as many categories of products, working overseas on a shared-cost basis with FAS. They have projects under way in more than 70 countries, including China.

I mention this because they apply expertise drawn from all segments of their business—from production, to processing, to marketing—to promote the use of U.S. farm products in foreign markets.

The work and results of these groups demonstrate the great and largely untapped potential of organized participation by the U.S. private sector in export expansion.

The cooperator work in China has been effective. Our exports there have grown from \$350 million in 1978 to \$1.8 billion last year.

Right now, the impasse over textile quotas is troublesome for our export trade with China, which is down this year, but we are hopeful that further negotiations will result in a satisfactory solution.

In focusing on foreign markets and trade, there is a tendency to overlook the impact of our own domestic farm programs on exports. However, the approach to domestic farm policy is basic to the course of export trade, and this has been amply demonstrated in the recent past.

The secretary discussed in detail the changes in domestic policies that occurred during the expansionary export period that started in the 1970s—the introduction of target prices, increased minimum support rates, farmer-owned reserves insulated from the market and other measures that seemed appropriate for the time.

However, these were no provisions for adjustment in response to a falling market, and the subsequent slump in world demand and drop in market prices have left the United States with farm support prices above market-clearing levels. This has cost us our ability to compete effectively in the world market.

To add to the injury, the higher U.S. support levels provide an incentive for competing countries to produce more. This is so because world price floors are heavily influenced by the price support level in the United States, which is a major producer and the leading exporter of most basic farm commodities.

When U.S. supports are above the market level, competitors can establish a price just below the U.S. rate and enjoy a price bonus in the prevailing market.

The appreciation of the dollar has enhanced this advantage. Australian and Canadian wheat producers, for example, currently enjoy an effective 15 to 20 percent increase in export prices as a combined result of the 11 percent increase in U.S. price support loans and the rise in the value of the dollar over the past 12 months.

So it should be no surprise that our competitors have not acted to curtail production in the face of world grain stocks at record levels and that U.S. grain exports have slumped.

Mr. Chairman, with these few examples, I have tried to show that agricultural trade is dependent on a combination of policies, both foreign and domestic.

Foreign policy measures can impact adversely on agricultural trade, as in the case of the Soviet embargo, and they can impact positively, as occurred with the improved relationships with China.

Domestic farm programs developed and implemented without regard to their trade effects, will, in the long run, hurt farm income by impeding exports, the key to full growth for the U.S. farm economy.

And finally, a world system of liberal agricultural trade, in which producers compete on the basis of comparative advantage, offers the best way to solid, sustainable, long-term growth in U.S. agricultural exports.

This concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to respond to questions.

#

Testimony by Douglas W. MacCleery, deputy assistant secretary, natural resources and environment, USDA, before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States House of Representatives, Concerning H.R. 2027, H.R. 2211 and H.R. 2982, June 14.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

We appreciate the opportunity to join the Subcommittee's deliberations on H.R. 2027, H.R. 2211, and H.R. 2982. These bills would exempt rural electric and telephone cooperatives, and irrigation conveyance systems from the payment of fees charged by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior for use of rights-of-way across National Forest System lands and public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. These payments are required by the provisions of Section 504 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Subsection (g) of that section states that "the holder of a right-of-way shall pay annually in advance the fair market value thereof." It is our belief that granting special exemptions to this authority, as would be done by the three bills, would be inequitable to other holders of rights-of-way across Federal lands and to the public at large. Hence, we strongly oppose the bills.

I should remark at the outset that we have a common policy with the Department of the Interior regarding rights-of-way fees. We jointly developed rules and regulations on the subject and apply them consistently between National Forest and public land.

Let me review the development, over many years, of the policies that today require that fair market value fees be assessed for use of rights-of-way on Federal land.

The fee requirement began in the nineteen seventies. Before that, in policy originating in 1938, free use was granted to the REA borrowers. The purpose was to promote a rural development objective of making power and telephone services available to rural areas. However, starting with the passage of the fees and charges provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952, many policies which allowed free use have been gradually tightened. In 1975, USDA's Office of Audit questioned Forest Service policy in light of the new authorities. The Forest Service, after consultation with the Rural Electrification Administration, concluded that free use could no longer be justified. Emphasis was placed upon collection of fair market value fees and charging recipients for specific benefits that are over and above those received by the general public.

The policy has evolved to the point where, as a matter of equity, we conclude that it is not appropriate to continue to allow free use when the holder of the right-of-way is engaged in a similar business and follows practices comparable to private commercial enterprise.

This policy was supported and expanded by the passage of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), which now provides our current direction. Section 102, setting forth broad congressional policy, declares that the United States should receive fair market value for the use of Federal land and resources.

Section 504 applies that policy specifically to rights-of-way. This section also provides discretionary authority to the Secretary to waive

part or all the fee for nonprofit associations and corporations not controlled or owned by profit-making corporations or business enterprises, if the secretary finds that such a waiver is equitable and in the public interest. Regulations adopted pursuant to that authority provide for a reduced or waived fee under certain circumstances. For example, if a right-of-way exclusively serves a Federal facility, a fee is not charged.

Fees may also be waived for facilities that contribute to the management of the National Forest or other Federal lands, such as an electrical line to wildlife or fishery improvements.

The adoption of the current policy and regulations on fees did not come about without a great deal of public advice. We received valuable discussion and indepth analysis in 1980 when we promulated rules on section 504 of FLPMA. Through this material, we have been able to gain a clearer understanding of the issue.

Although most rural electric cooperatives service mostly rural customers, some are involved in commercial practices comparable to those of investor-owned utilities. Providing free use to the cooperative while charging the investor-owned utility for use of NFS land would not be equitable. Thus, the regulations provide for the payment of fair market value fees by cooperatives and other permit holders when their principal source of revenue from the permitted use is customer charges.

An appraisal is made in determining the fee for rights-of-way over Federal lands. The market evidence used in these appraisals is typically derived from a wide market area that includes both cooperatives and investor-owned utilities. The fees will vary according to the amount and value of the land under permit. Our records show that fees for most right-of-way permits are less than \$1,000 per year. We believe the impact of these fees is light, and the added cost to the customer attributable to the fee is generally minimal. For example, the fees paid by nine electric distribution cooperatives holding permits on National Forest lands in Montana amount to about \$0.08 per year for each of the 63,926 metered customers. The range of fees is from \$0.01 to \$0.45 per customer per year. Fees paid by eight electric distribution cooperatives with permitted rights-of-way on National Forest land in Missouri amount to about \$0.05 per year for each of the 121,435 metered customers. It should also be pointed out that not all borrowers of

Federal funds under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, which is the criteria for exemption under the provisions of H.R. 2027 and H.R. 2211, are rural electric and telephone cooperatives. Although most loans insured or guaranteed by REA are made to electric and telephone cooperatives, some are also made to rural telephone companies.

Fees for water transmission rights-of-way involving National Forest System land, including those cases where the permittee or user owns rights to the water being transported, are assessed under the same provision of FLPMA as the electric and telephone cooperatives. We began charging fees in 1971 under authority existing at that time. Prior to that time, permits were issued without charge under authority of the Act of June 4, 1897, an organic act for National Forest administration. However, in 1971 it was decided that charges for permits would not be initiated until either (1) a change of ownership occurred, (2) the permits expired, or (3) there was a change in the use of facilities authorized. This procedure was carried forward into the FLPMA process. That act does not require that existing permits be reissued; hence, some users holding permits dated prior to 1971 continue to receive free use. A new permit conforming to the FLPMA requirements is required whenever there is a change of ownership, an existing permit expires, or a change in the facilities or their use occurs.

Ownership of water rights does not exempt users from the permit and fee requirements. Conversely, the requirements for a right-of-way permit does not affect any individual water rights. We believe that these requirements are generally accepted by ranchers and farmers. In our view, they provide protection for them as well as being of benefit in the event of a sale of the property.

Charging for use of right-of-way is not unique to the Federal land managing agencies. To be sure, cooperatives and investor-owned utilities generally insist that members or customers provide free right-of-way across their property. However, some cooperatives now pay small landowners for rights-of-way that provide power to commercial entities such as sawmills or oil and gas wells. Large landowners often require payment for distribution or transmission purposes.

Several large timber companies in the northern Rocky Mountain Region and in the South are charging rural electric and telephone cooperatives for rights-of-way across their lands. In general, we find

that landowners charge for rights-of-way in any situation where they perceive no benefit from the rights-of-way. If there is a benefit to them, there will likely be no charge for the easement. This is essentially the same approach adopted by the Forest Service. That concludes my prepared statement. I would be happy to respond to the Subcommittee's questions.

#

News Releases

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

BLOCK NAMES ESPARZA AS DIRECTOR OF MINORITY AFFAIRS

WASHINGTON, June 10—Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block today named Alma Riojas Esparza, 41, as director of minority affairs for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, effective June 13.

Esparza has been executive assistant for the office of small and disadvantaged business utilization at the Department of Defense since January 1983. As executive assistant, she was responsible for all aspects of the management of the office, including the small business program, the small disadvantaged business program, the labor surplus area program and the women-owned business program.

From June 1981 to January 1983, she was executive assistant in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for manpower, reserve affairs and logistics. In this position, she was responsible for the overall management of personnel—both military and civilian—space requirements and security management.

She has also worked as a management consultant in the office of the secretary of defense. She was a member of President-elect Reagan's Transition Team.

Before entering federal service, she held positions as sales representative, quality control auditor, procedures analyst, district and area manager for the United Services Automobile Insurance Co., San Antonio, Texas.

A native of San Antonio, Esparza won a National Science Foundation Scholarship to attend Texas Women's University while she was a high school student. She also attended San Antonio College, Our Lady of the Lake University and the University of Texas at Austin.

#

USDA PROPOSES MINOR CHANGES TO GRAIN EXPORTING REGISTRATION RULES

WASHINGTON, June 10—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing minor changes to regulations concerning the requirement and procedures for registration of grain exporting firms.

Federal Grain Inspection Service Administrator Kenneth A. Gilles said the proposed changes involve rewriting and reorganizing the regulations to simplify, clarify and condense certain language.

Also, some provisions, which are no longer applicable, will be deleted. These include:

- procedures used only during initial implementation of the registration program;
- provisions dealing with withdrawal of an application since registration is mandatory for firms regularly engaged in grain exporting;
- provisions dealing with possession of certificates, since they are issued annually to each approved applicant;
- the requirement that suspended or revoked registration certificates be returned to the agency, since possession of such certificates does not enable firms to engage in foreign commerce, and the certificates would expire at the end of the calendar year anyway; and
- the provisions concerning renewed certificates to simplify the mechanics of the registration program and permit use of the same type of certificate for new registrations and renewals.

Comments should be sent in duplicate by Aug. 12 to Lewis Lebakken, Jr., Regulations and Directives Management, USDA, FGIS, rm. 0667-S, Washington, D.C., 20250. Phone: (202) 382-1738.

Notice of the action is scheduled to be published in the June 13 Federal Register.

#

USDA PROPOSES RULE TO AMEND DUTIES AND CONDUCT REGULATIONS

WASHINGTON, June 10—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing changes to its regulations on duties and conduct of official grain inspection personnel and warehouse samplers.

Federal Grain Inspection Service Administrator Kenneth A. Gilles said the proposal deletes the requirement that licensees and warehouse samplers report changes in the scope of their duties and employment because it duplicates what is required of the official agency.

The proposal also adds a new paragraph which states that warehouse samplers are exempt from the conflict-of-interest provisions that apply to employees of the Federal Grain Inspection Service or official inspection agencies. The samplers are still subject to standards of conduct in the regulations.

Gilles said the changes were made as the result of a periodic review of existing regulations, which is required by executive order. USDA determined that these regulations, in general, are serving their intended purpose and should remain in effect.

Details of the proposed amendments to the regulation will be published in the June 13 Federal Register.

Public comments may be submitted before Aug. 12, in duplicate, to Lewis Lebakken, Jr., Regulations and Directives Management, FGIS, USDA, Room 0667-S, Washington, D.C. 20250. Telephone (202) 322-1738.

#

TWO SCIENTISTS SHARE ANIMAL RESEARCH HONOR, \$10,000 PRIZE

FORT COLLINS, Colo., June 13—An international \$10,000 prize, the Alexander von Humbolt award, will be shared by two U.S. animal scientists for their genetic engineering research related to animals.

Howard L. Bachrach of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and George E. Seidel, Jr., of Colorado State University, will receive—in ceremonies here today—the award which honors the scientists whose

research has made the "greatest contribution to the agricultural sciences" in the past 3-5 years.

Bachrach led a research team that developed basic information about foot and mouth disease virus that pointed to the pathway for the first genetically engineered vaccine against foot-and-mouth disease of cattle and swine. He is based at the Plum Island, N.Y., Animal Disease Center of the USDA's Agricultural Research Service.

Seidel was research leader of a team in the Animal Reproduction Laboratory at Colorado State's College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences that used embryo-splitting techniques to produce the first cloned twin calves in North America.

Bachrach worked for 25 years to find the right protein that could be used to produce a sub-unit vaccine for foot-and-mouth disease. He and colleagues at Plum Island demonstrated that an effective vaccine for swine could be made from a portion of the virus called VP1 or viral protein number 1.

At this stage, collaboration began with scientists from Genentech, a San Francisco research firm, to produce a vaccine using gene splicing technology. That led to expressing the VP1 in a bacterium—the first production of an effective vaccine against any disease of animals or humans through gene splicing.

Seidel, 39, has devoted a major part of his professional life to embryo transfer research.

In 1973, Seidel organized the first embryo transfer unit for cattle at Colorado State's Animal Reproduction Laboratory to service the cattle industry and to train veterinarians. Over the last 10 years, the unit has transferred more than 7,000 embryos.

Seidel's successful cloning of embryos grew out of his work with the University's Embryo Transfer Laboratory. In his award-winning research, he and his colleagues collect embryos from cows one week after fertilization, using nonsurgical techniques.

They split the embryos with a tiny sliver of a razor blade under a microscope and implant the halves into uteri of cows. This results in two genetically identical twin calves.

According to university officials, this work is potentially worth millions to the cattle industry in increased production and will be invaluable to researchers in all fields of animal science.

Bachrach is a fellow of the New York Academy of Sciences and of the National Academy of Sciences. He is a member of the American Chemical Society, the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, the American Society for Microbiology and the American Society for Virology.

Backrach was one of ten recipients of the 1982 AAAS-Newcomb Cleveland prize and he won the National Award for Agricultural Excellence from the National Agri-Marketing Association in 1983.

Seidel is a member of the American Dairy Science Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, International Embryo Transfer Society and the Society for the Study of Reproduction. Among other awards, Seidel recently received the Andrew G. Clark award for research and creativity from Colorado State University and the Sigma Xi Honor Scientist Award from the university.

#

USDA ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS FROM NONCERTIFIED EGG PRODUCERS

WASHINGTON, June 13—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is now accepting certification applications from all noncertified egg producer groups interested in nominating members to the 18-member American Egg Board.

"We will soon request nominations to replace the nine members and their alternates whose two-year terms expire at the end of 1983," said H. Connor Kennett, a poultry official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service. "Only egg producer groups that are also certified by the secretary of agriculture as eligible to nominate members will be allowed to submit nominees."

Kennett said the noncertified groups have until July 11 to file for certification to be eligible to participate in this year's nominating process.

The American Egg Board administers research and promotional projects designed to strengthen the egg industry's competitive position in the market place. Its activities are carried out under the egg research

and promotion order, authorized by the Egg Research and Consumer Information Act.

Certification forms and information on eligibility are available from Janice Lockard, Poultry Division, Room 3955-S, AMS, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250. Phone (202) 382-8132.

#

USDA WITHDRAWS PROPOSAL TO TEST EXPORT SWINE

WASHINGTON, June 13—U.S. Department of Agriculture officials have withdrawn proposed federal regulations requiring swine to be separated and tested for pseudorabies before export.

John K. Atwell, deputy administrator of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, said agency veterinarians decided against the proposal after reviewing 37 public comments and considering current export health practices. All but one comment opposed the export health proposal.

Atwell said representatives of the pork industry, purebred breeders and agricultural organizations felt the requirements would be unworkable. They said the proposed rules would provide no more assurance against exposure to pseudorabies than existing export requirements.

Currently swine must be examined by a USDA-accredited veterinarian and certified free of communicable diseases of swine. The accredited veterinarian must also certify that the hogs have not been fed garbage, and have passed a negative test for swine brucellosis. No new swine may be introduced into the herd for 30 days before the export shipment.

Atwell said foreign countries impose their own requirements when receiving exported U.S. swine. Most of these already require negative pseudorabies tests before shipment.

Notice of this action is scheduled to be published in the June 14 Federal Register.

#

DIRECTOR NAMED FOR USDA'S NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

WASHINGTON, June 14—Joseph H. Howard is the new director of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Agricultural Library.

Howard's appointment was announced today by Orville G. Bentley, USDA assistant secretary of agriculture for science and education. The new director had been acting director of the library since last December. At the same time, he served as assistant librarian (processing services) of the Library of Congress.

With 1.7 million volumes, the National Agricultural Library is the largest of its kind in the free world. It is one of three national libraries along with the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine.

A native of Olustee, Okla., Howard received a bachelor's degree from the University of Oklahoma in 1952. After serving with the U.S. Army for two years and teaching from 1954 to 1956 in the Kiowa (Kansas) public schools, he returned to the University of Oklahoma, where he received a master's degree in library science in 1957.

Howard served with the University of Colorado libraries from 1957 to 1963. In March 1963, he entered the Peace Corps and directed the public services division of the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur.

In July 1965, Howard became the chief of the catalog department at Washington University Libraries, St. Louis, Mo. In 1967, he joined the Library of Congress as assistant chief of the descriptive cataloging division. He was promoted to chief of that division in 1968; in 1972, he was appointed chief of the serials records division; and in 1975 assistant director (cataloging) before becoming assistant librarian (processing services) in 1976.

Howard lives in Washington and is a member of the American Library Association. In 1982, he served as on the interagency panel which assessed the National Agricultural Library. He is the author of "Malay Manuscripts—A Bibliographical Guide."

#

CRYOGENICS: SCIENTISTS BRING FROZEN INSECT CELLS BACK TO LIFE

NOTE: Scientists are using cryogenic technology more and more. A new development, freezing insect cells, is reported here for the first time. Following that, other cryogenic research projects are summarized.

FARGO, N.D., June 15—Some insects can be frozen and brought back to life, opening possibilities for preserving their genes to play a future role in the biological control of pests.

A collection of housefly embryonic cells is surviving after being thawed by a research team led by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Roger A. Leopold here. For eight years, the cells had been frozen in liquid nitrogen at -321 degrees Fahrenheit (-196 degrees Celsius).

Houseflies are ideal for freezing studies because they are easily and cheaply reared, producing a generation every 10 days. What is learned from deep freezing houseflies will enable scientists to speed adaption of cryogenics to insects that prey on pests of livestock and crops.

Leopold, an entomologist with USDA's Agricultural Research Service, said the research team, in another cryogenic experiment, froze housefly embryos at -4 degrees Fahrenheit (-20 degrees Celsius), for one hour. About 85 percent of the embryos survived.

He said the freezing technique requires further refinement before it can be used to store whole insects. When that happens, he predicted, scientists will draw upon banks of frozen insect cells and embryos as routinely as they now do plant and animal germplasm.

A major reason why Leopold's team is investigating cryogenics is to safeguard desirable and often unique strains of insects from the "genetic drift" that complicates biological control efforts.

"Insects change when they are raised in factory-like insectaries for mass release," said Leopold. "They lose some of the good genetic traits they exhibited in the wild."

That means such important traits as vigor are altered over the years in mass rearing, the entomologist said.

To overcome genetic drift, the researchers are attempting to transfer preserved embryonic cells into housefly embryos. These cells become additional sperm and eggs within the recipient embryo. Offspring that hatch are bred with a similar strain to try to recover the original gene pool.

Of the resulting progeny, 25 percent will be genetically identical with the original strain. Had the technique been developed earlier, said Leopold, the Fargo laboratory would have been able to save 200 different strains of houseflies for research.

"Maintaining such a large collection proved so laborious and expensive that we now rear only three of the strains," he said. "Regrettably, some of our old strains no longer can be found anywhere for propagation and study."

Cooperating with Leopold in the research are cell biologist James D. Bramer and zoologist Albert E. Heacox of North Dakota State University. The studies are being conducted at USDA's Metabolism and Radiation Research Laboratory.

Current research at the laboratory is focused on such livestock pests as houseflies, face flies and screwworms, all members of Diptera—the largest order or classification of insects.

CRYOGENIC APPLICATIONS ON THE INCREASE—Although cyrogenic technology was first reported in the 1890's, its practical application to agriculture came relatively recently, said Terry B. Kinney, Jr., administrator of USDA's research agency.

"Research has enabled today's agriculture to employ cryogenics in storing semen, treating certain animal diseases, identifying livestock and preserving tissue cultures, pollen and seeds," Kinney said. He said deep freezing technology promises to play an especially vital role in safeguarding the world's still existing plant germplasm.

"Already, scientists at the U.S. Seed Storage Laboratory in Fort Collins, Colo., have succeeded in freezing seeds of 140 different crop plants," Kinney said. "Future progress should make it possible to preserve plant germplasm indefinitely for 100 years and more. Besides protecting irreplaceable germplasm, that achievement has the potential to reduce seed storage costs five fold."

FOR THE FIRST TIME, TREES ARE CRYOGENICALLY PRESERVED—Even after freezing to -321 degrees Fahrenheit (-196 degrees Celsius), the callus material of date palm trees still was able to produce tiny plantlets. Callus is shapeless white tissue with all the genetic information needed to produce full-grown palm trees.

The freezing technique was applied to date palms by USDA plant geneticist Brent Tisserat. It reportedly was the first time a tree species was preserved cryogenically.

Tisserat envisions breeding studies of the future that will be performed with pollen from male trees hundreds of years after the trees have disappeared. By contrast, in nature date palm pollen lasts only one or two growing seasons and date palm seeds, 15 years.

Success with the date palm sets the precedent for frozen storage of other valuable fruit tree germplasm. The cryogenic technique already has been applied successfully to tissue cultures of carrots, tobacco, sugarcane, alfalfa and rice. The technique also has been applied to growing points and buds of carnations, potatoes, peas and strawberries.

SPERM BANKS FREEZE SUPERIOR GENES FOR CHICKENS—Superior chickens are being bred from sperm banks made possible by cryogenic technology for freezing chicken semen.

The technique, developed at the Beltsville, Md., Agricultural Research Center, has since been modified for use on exotic and endangered species of birds, such as the whooping crane, in a program sponsored by the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Frozen sperm banks enhance the genetic value of superior roosters that have been selected for such desirable traits as tenderness, meatiness and feed conversion efficiency. The technique permits the use of semen from one selected male to inseminate 20 to 30 hens per day rather than the usual 10.

Thomas Sexton, poultry specialist who works on the cryogenic research, said the technique improves on previous technology by compensating for the ill effects of freezing on the longevity of thawed semen.

TROPICAL SEEDS CAN BE FROZEN—Seeds of tropical plants are not usually suited for storage in liquid nitrogen at a temperature of -196 degrees Celsius, but now researchers have successfully frozen seeds of nine species.

In some cases, freezing improved germination over that of conventional storage, according to Phillip C. Stanwood, a USDA Agriculture agronomist.

The fragility of tropical and subtropical seeds limits the amount of time they can be handled after conventional storage. Tropical

germplasm is commonly preserved the expensive way: continual regrowth in protected environments, a method that risks disastrous losses.

Stanwood says the key to success is that moisture is reduced in the seeds before they are stored in liquid nitrogen. The plants with improved germination percentages are apple of sodom, ceara rubber and prickly poppy.

Success also was achieved with seeds of passionfruit, dwarf shefflera, common guava, papaya, seaberry, and strawberry guava, with the lowest germination at 91 percent that of conventional handling.

FREEZING CURES EYE DISEASE IN ANIMALS—Ultra-cold freezing of glaucoma-damaged eyes in dogs, horses, cats and other animals is successful in curing the painful disease. Glaucoma does not return.

If the freezing is done before the animal's eyesight is totally lost, vision can be returned to normal, according to USDA animal disease expert John R. Gorham in Pullman, Wash. Researchers there earlier developed a cryogenic technique for "freezing-marking," a humane alternative to fire branding in cattle identification.

The new glaucoma treatment is simple and low-cost. Treatment consists of chilling a copper rod to super-low temperatures and applying it to the animal's afflicted eyeball for a few seconds at a time, until the cornea of the eye is frozen.

FERTILITY OF HOP POLLEN SURVIVES DEEP FREEZING—Hop pollen can be preserved by deep freezing for more than a year without significant loss of fertility research by a USDA geneticist indicates.

Hops are the main flavoring ingredient in beer, and the United States is the world's leading hop producer.

Alfred Haunold, of the USDA research agency, said hop pollen rarely is fertile after a year of conventional refrigeration.

Now, advances in cryogenics should enhance the breeding of superior varieties, a goal he said heretofore was hampered by the flowering characteristics of hop plants.

"A cross between an early flowering female and a late flowering male often has been difficult to achieve. Being able to keep pollen

viable in storage will help overcome this difficulty and benefit breeding programs," Haunold said.

New and better varieties of hops could lead to a wider range of beer flavors.

#

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CANNING FRUITS AND VEGETABLES REVISED FOR GREATER SAFETY

WASHINGTON, June 15—If you home-can fruits and vegetables this summer, be aware of new recommendations for home-canning from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a food safety official urged today.

Milton Baldauf, food safety program leader for USDA's Extension Service, said the instructions for home-canning fruits and vegetables have been changed in the interest of increased safety, based on the latest research findings.

Safe canning of many fruits and vegetables, he said, requires approximately twice as much time as had been recommended earlier.

Following the new instructions, said Baldauf, is important because they provide better protection against spoilage and, under certain circumstances, botulism, in canned tomatoes. They also help prevent botulism in strained pumpkin and squash and mold spoilage of applesauce and fruit purees.

Baldauf pointed to these new canning recommendations:

Applesauce—pint and quart jars and No. 2 and No. 2 1/2 cans, 20 minutes in a boiling water bath at 212 degrees Fahrenheit; fruit purees—pint and quart jars and No. 2 and 2 1/2 cans, 20 minutes in a boiling water bath at 212 degrees. This is 10 minutes longer than was suggested earlier.

Hot Pack Tomatoes—pint jars and No. 2 cans, 35 minutes, and quart jars and No. 2 1/2 cans, 45 minutes in a boiling water bath at 212 degrees. Previously, the suggested time was 10 minutes. The raw pack method of preserving tomatoes no longer is recommended until additional research can be completed.

Tomato juice—pint and quart jars and No. 2 and No. 2 1/2 cans, 35 minutes in a boiling water bath at 212 degrees, up from 10 minutes for jars and 15 minutes for cans.

Pumpkin—Strained pumpkin no longer is recommended to be canned. It is suggested that pumpkin be cubed and canned in a pressure canner at 10 pounds pressure, 240 degrees, pint jars 55 minutes, quart jars 90 minutes, No. 2 cans 50 minutes, and No. 2 1/2 cans 75 minutes. If strained pumpkin is required, it is suggested that the pumpkin be preserved by freezing.

Winter squash—Follow the same procedure as for pumpkin.

Baldauf said the revised instructions are based on research by USDA's Eastern Regional Research Center, Agricultural Research Service, Philadelphia, and agricultural experiment stations at land grant universities in Minnesota, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts.

County extension offices, where home-canning guidance is available in cooperation with the USDA Extension Service and the land grant universities, have the revised recommendations. The changes also may be found in the revised USDA Home and Garden Bulletin No. 8, "Home Canning of Fruits and Vegetables."

The publication—Stock Number 001-000-03535-5—is available for \$2.50 from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C. 20402.

#

USDA SEEKS COMMENTS ON TEXAS QUARANTINE ISSUE

WASHINGTON, June 15—The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing to quarantine Texas cattle for brucellosis after a comment period, rather than contesting a U.S. District Court's ruling on a June 1 emergency quarantine, according to a USDA official.

"Any final quarantine will be based upon public comments received by July 25," said John K. Atwell, deputy administrator for veterinary services for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. "In the interim, we hope the Texas governor and legislature will take action that will make a quarantine unnecessary."

USDA announced an emergency quarantine of Texas cattle for brucellosis on June 1. However, the move was enjoined by the U.S. District Court in Austin, Texas.

"Our decision to withdraw the emergency nature of the quarantine notice was based in part on the Texas governor's willingness to place the Texas brucellosis issue on the agenda of a special session of the Texas legislature," said Atwell.

"Also, providing for a comment period now should allow the quickest resolution of this issue," he said.

Brucellosis, sometimes called Bang's disease, can cause pregnant cows to abort or to give birth to weak calves. The disease has a variable and sometimes lengthy incubation period.

Under quarantine provisions, only cattle from "qualified herds" can be shipped out of state for breeding. To qualify, a herd must pass two negative herd tests for brucellosis within 120 days.

In addition to having the negative herd tests, individual animals being shipped for breeding must be tested and found negative within 30 days of shipment.

Requirements for moving infected and exposed cattle from infected herds and finished fed cattle from quarantined feedlots would not be changed by the quarantine.

Animals from other than qualified herds—including unspayed heifers coming out of feedlots—must be branded with an "S" and shipped for slaughter only. Animals from qualified herds can be shipped to slaughter without branding if they test negative within 30 days and are accompanied by a certificate showing test results.

"USDA has worked closely with Texas officials since 1979 to find a solution to disease control problems that arose when a state court ruled that the Texas Animal Health Commission lacked legal authority to test

all Texas herds suspected of being infected with brucellosis," said Atwell.

"When the Texas Supreme Court, in March, upheld lower court rulings preventing testing, we still hoped the legal problem could be resolved by the Texas legislature passing a bill to strengthen the state's brucellosis regulations," he said.

"However, the Texas legislature adjourned May 30 without passing the law, leaving the possibility of untested Texas cattle spreading brucellosis across state lines. USDA has a responsibility to protect the cattle industries in all the states," Atwell said.

Comments on the quarantine proposal should be sent by July 25 to the deputy administrator, USDA, APHIS, Veterinary Services, Room 813 Federal Building, 6505 Belcrest Rd., Hyattsville, Md. 20702.

Notice of the proposal is scheduled to be published in the June 17 Federal Register.

#

CRANBERRY GROWERS VOTE TO CONTINUE MARKETING ORDER

WASHINGTON, June 16—Cranberry growers in 10 states have voted to continue the federal marketing order program that regulates the handling of their crop.

The program covers cranberries grown in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington and Long Island, N.Y.

Charles Brader, a marketing official with USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, said the program requires a referendum every four years. Growers producing cranberries in any of the designated areas are eligible to vote.

Brader said 41 percent of eligible growers voted in the May 18-28 referendum. Of those voting, 89 percent, accounting for 95 percent of volume of production represented, favored continuance of the marketing order.

A marketing order is a means, backed by federal law, whereby agricultural producers and handlers can work together to solve

marketing problems. The program for cranberries was initiated and designed by producers in cooperation with the Agricultural Marketing Service.

#

FOREIGN AGRICULTURE MINISTERS TO VISIT BLOCK FARM

WASHINGTON, June 16—Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block has invited ministers of agriculture from 50 countries to visit his Illinois farm June 25 for a tour and informal discussion of the world food situation. Many of the ministers will be in the United States for the annual meeting of the World Food Council in New York June 26-30.

"This visit will allow us to meet in an informal setting to discuss topics of mutual interest," Block said. "It would also give our guests a grass roots look at U.S. agriculture, which has a very important role in world food security."

On the Block farm, the visitors will tour test plots and fields employing soil conservation techniques. They also will view hog production facilities and methods, farm equipment and storage areas.

#

BUSH, SHULTZ TO ADDRESS JULY 12-13 AG SUMMIT

WASHINGTON, June 17—Vice President George Bush and Secretary of State George Shultz are among administration officials scheduled to address a July 12-13 agricultural summit meeting in Washington, Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block announced today.

Block said he initiated the summit meeting to give agricultural leaders and representatives of related businesses an opportunity to take a comprehensive look at current issues common to everyone involved in the food and fiber system.

"With recovery underway, agriculture will be entering a new era," Block said. "It's important that we take a collective look at the issues

so that we are better prepared to give direction to our industry as it enters that era."

Block said the summit will open the doors for participants to discuss today's most significant agricultural questions with USDA's top staff, government leaders, fellow executives in agriculture and selected officers from industry, labor and consumer organizations.

"Our objective is to begin discussions about the problems and challenges we will face in the years ahead," he said. "All of our questions will not be answered during this summit, but it will represent the beginning of a dialogue in which these leaders can share their diversified concerns and constructive thoughts."

Herbert L. Stein, senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, Washington, D.C., is also scheduled to address the summit.

#

Background

U.S. Department of Agriculture • Office of Governmental and Public Affairs

CANNABIS ERADICATION

During the past four years, the illegal cultivation of cannabis for the production of marijuana has increased on private and public lands, including the National Forests. During 1982, about 6,000 cannabis cultivation sites were identified within the National Forests. These sites supported from 14 plants to 4,410 plants.

Investigations indicate that cannabis is currently growing on most of the 155 National Forests. The popularity of the National Forests for this illegal activity is attributable to two facts: (1) many of the forests encompass remote areas and (2) because the forests are public lands, cannabis growers cannot be identified on the basis of land ownership.

The Forest Service's concerns regarding the cultivation of cannabis within the National Forests include: (1) illegality of the activity and (2) safety of visitors and employees. Last year, more than 250 incidents were reported in which National Forest visitors and Forest Service employees were threatened by people suspected of growing or protecting cannabis plantations. These incidents ranged from the firing of warning shots to verbal harassment.

Numerous booby traps and other security devices used by cannabis growers to protect their crops have also been encountered. Some of these devices could fatally injure anyone who inadvertently triggered them. As part of their cultivation activities, cannabis growers also use high concentrations of herbicides and pesticides, divert streams and destroy wildlife that might damage their crops. These activities can have serious negative impacts on the effective management of the National Forests.

Identification and eradication of cannabis plots is primarily the responsibility of the Drug Enforcement Administration and state and local law enforcement agencies. The Forest Service role is to cooperate with appropriate federal, state and local law enforcement agencies as part of the total effort to deter and eradicate cannabis.

The Drug Enforcement Administration is currently developing plans to provide for a coordinated approach to locating, investigating and eradicating domestically grown cannabis. The Forest Service believes

the situation demands aggressive action. Enforcement agencies should eradicate cannabis using the most effective legal methods available, whether by mechanical means or by the use of herbicides.

#